



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

the policies of Alcibiades as he had earlier advocated those of Pericles. Alcibiades after his rebuff at the hands of Sparta threw himself into the arms of Argos, from ancient times the enemy of Sparta and friend of Athens, like Athens a democracy. The details of his operations are related in the fifth book of Thucydides. It would take too long to give all minutiae of the negotiations between Sparta and Athens on the one hand and Sparta and Boeotia on the other. Suffice it to note that Alcibiades at a crisis in the negotiations sent a message to Argos that here was her opportunity, promising her his aid. The Argives did not fail to appreciate the advantages of an alliance with their old friend Athens, possessor of a navy that could be of great worth to them in time of war. Their envoys hastened to Athens; Spartan envoys came too, but failed of an honest hearing by the famous trickery of Alcibiades, of whom however it must be said that he was no more dishonest than his Spartan dupes. Nicias in his zeal for peace and Sparta went to Lacedaemon to make Athenian demands. The Spartans refused to give up their private alliance with the Boeotians and the Athenians, smarting under a sense of injustice done them, made their treaty with Argos and her allies. This treaty, the full text of which is given by Thucydides in his fifth book, might well be called the Treaty of Alcibiades, as the treaty with Sparta the year before is known as the Peace of Nicias. The Suppliants celebrates the treaty with Argos, concludes with a solemn and detailed treaty made between Athens and Argos, and emphasizes hatred towards Sparta and Boeotia. Sparta is brought in quite gratuitously for attack. She is called brutal and a folk of shifty ways, apropos of nothing in the play. There is a remarkable passage where the three classes in the Athenian state are described; the highest class and the proletariat are alike condemned and of the middle class it is said *τριῶν δὲ μοιρῶν ἡ 'ν μέσῳ σφίξει πόλεις, κόσμον φυλάσσουσ' ὄντιν' ἂν τάξῃ πόλις*. This corresponds with the political creed set forth as that of himself and his ancestors by Alcibiades in the speech at Sparta reported by Thucydides 6. 89. He too is against *οἱ τύραννοι* and also against the *δχλος*. Note his words:

*Τῆς δὲ ὑπαρχούσης ἀκολασίας ἐπειρώμεθα μετριώτεροι εἰς τὰ πολιτικά εἶναι. — ἡμεῖς δὲ τοῦ ξυμπαντος προέστημεν, διακαίοντες ἐν ᾧ σχήματι μεγίστη ἡ πόλις ἐτύγχανε καὶ ἐλευθερωτάτη ὅσα καὶ ἔπερ ἐδέξατο τις τοῦτο ξυνδιασφίξειν.*

Here the same constitutional views are expressed as in the Euripidean lines. Here then we have Euripides writing a play in glorification of the Argive alliance, a treaty which was distinctly the work of Alcibiades. And this play was written in the year of Alcibiades's splendid victories at Olympia, for which Euripides wrote the triumphal ode.

During the next two years Alcibiades bent all his restless and stormy energy toward breaking the Peace of Nicias. This we learn from the history of

his contemporary Thucydides, who must have known Alcibiades as a boy and young man, though he himself was in exile during these years. But the vivid personality of Alcibiades is presented to us by Thucydides with as much clearness of outline as that of Pericles, whom Thucydides knew so well. Alcibiades now went from one end of Peloponnesus to another, using his eloquence, his personal charm and his power of swaying people to his will so effectively that he brought Sparta into a combat for her all, to use his own words as given by Thucydides, at Mantinea. The Spartans there met Argives, Mantineans, Eleans and Athenians in battle. Sparta conquered and the Peace of Nicias was technically unimpaired by the incident. This action against Sparta on the part of Alcibiades and his following brought about a crisis in Athenian politics. The question of Athenian policy was sharply debated; Sparta with Nicias or anti-Sparta with Alcibiades were the alternatives. Ostracism had not been employed in Athens since the choice between Pericles and Thucydides son of Melesias in 442. The people still voted in the first ecclesia of the sixth prytany of each year whether to employ ostracism or not in the current year. The political situation after Mantinea required drastic measures and the people voted in this year to employ ostracism. But times had changed and this type of deadly political duel was not suited to the new order of things. The affair took an unexpected turn as neither Nicias nor Alcibiades found it convenient to be ostracized. They therefore came to an agreement to make at the last moment a scape-goat of Hyperbolus the demagogue.

Euripides's *Andromache* must, in my judgment, be placed in this year 417. It is another political play. It is filled with the bitterest denunciation of Sparta and its tone is exactly in accord with the Athenian feeling toward that state after Mantinea. Bergk, though his dating of the play is wrong, yet sees in it Euripides's sympathy for Alcibiades. He does not admire Euripides and says that Alcibiades found him a convenient tool for his schemes and venom. Bergk's position is untenable, but the play shows throughout in its political 'Tendenz' that it was written by a partisan of Alcibiades. In 471 ff. there is a reference, I believe, to the struggle between Nicias and Alcibiades.

GRACE HARRIET MACURDY

VASSAR COLLEGE

(To be concluded.)

## REVIEW<sup>1</sup>

P. Terenti Afri Comoediae. Edited by Sidney G. Ashmore, Union College. New York: Oxford University Press, American Branch (1908). Pp. X + 68 (Introduction) + 4 (Vita Terenti) + 289 (Text) + 340 (Explanatory Notes and Index). \$1.50.

<sup>1</sup>In Number 19, Professor Ashmore will make reply to Professor Fairclough.—C. K.

A collective edition of Terence, with all the plays annotated, is a task that has seldom been essayed in recent years. In English, only two such editions have appeared since the middle of last century, one by St. John Parry (London, 1857) and the other by Wagner (London, 1869). Of the former Professor Ashmore says that "though interesting for its explanatory notes, it is lacking in critical discernment", and as to the latter he claims that "its critical value is impaired by carelessness". His own edition, it may be inferred, will be free from these grave faults.

The book is beautifully printed by the Riverside Press and the editor is to be congratulated on having his work published in such an attractive manner and is so compact a form.

The text was evidently chosen for the editor by the publishers, who in 1902 brought out a complete Terence in the Oxford series, with a text and brief critical apparatus prepared by Professor Tyrrell of Dublin. It is natural enough, under the circumstances, that Professor Ashmore should edit Tyrrell's text, but when he advances the claim that this text is superior to Dziatzko's, we must demur. As a matter of fact, Tyrrell's text is very imperfect and often quite unsafe, being the work of one who has not kept abreast of the progress made in Terentian studies in recent years. If any one is inclined to doubt the fairness of this judgment, we have only to refer him to the searching review published in the Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift (vol. 23), by Wessner, the editor of Donatus, who concludes with the verdict that it is "burdened with all kinds of shortcomings" and "presents practically no claim to independent worth". Wessner's review appeared in 1903, five years ago, but one must infer from the edition before us that Professor Ashmore has never seen it. True, some of the blunders pointed out by Wessner have been rectified, but there are many others which a careful editor should have avoided, especially when they have been proclaimed from the house-top. Thus Professor Ashmore still keeps the unnecessary ictus in *ut sese habet* (Andr. 377), *visum solidumst gaudium* (Andr. 647) and *per fallaciam abstuli* (Ph. 1038), all of which, as Wessner has pointed out, are due to carelessness in transposition. Some of Tyrrell's peculiar readings, too, need a defence. Thus he has a weakness for *equidem*, which he substitutes freely for *quidem*, even with second and third persons (e. g. Andr. 225, Ph. 687, 754). Yet our editor makes no comment, and indeed the word finds no place whatever in his Index. The same is true of *ist* (an editorial invention, as in Andr. 906), *rest* (as in Andr. 459), *ipsust* (as in Hec. 343), and *reapse* (Hec. 417). If an editor deals at all with textual criticism, it is surely distinctive readings of this sort that call for discussion.

One disadvantage in an editor's being committed to a prescribed text lies in the fact that sometimes

he will himself be compelled to dissent from it, and this not seldom produces an inconsistency between text and commentary. In the present case the editor's frequent remark, "I prefer the reading", etc., shows that even he does not always regard Tyrrell as a safe guide. Such dissent may be illustrated at Andr. 145, 155, 171, 204-205 (where the editor "prefers" *hoc* to *haud* and "perhaps" *dices* to *dicas*), 276 (where *vereor* is "better suited" than *verear*), 288 (where the editor substitutes *et ad rem* for *et ad rem*, but leaves a foot note which is now inconsistent with the text), 322 (where *odipiscier* of the Mss. is preferred to Fleckeisen's and Tyrrell's *apiscier*; cf. Ph. 406), 369, 439, 525 (Tyrrell's *atqui* for *atque* is "unnecessary"), 527 (where Tyrrell is one of the "many editors, who have failed to restore *ipse*"), 536 (where the editor defends *pauca*, though the text has *pauis*), 650 (where the Mss. reading, though not given in the text, is defended), 682, 816 (where *lubet* appears in the text, but *licet*, which Tyrrell has not even noticed, is preferred).

Professor Ashmore has shown in a few places (e. g. Andr. 248), that he was at liberty to alter Tyrrell's footnotes, and yet he has not exercised this right at Ph. 370, where Tyrrell's note must make most scholars either blush or smile, for in it we are seriously invited to pronounce *inimicitias* as *inimishas*! To the credit, however, of the American editor, we find a similar explanation of *pudicitiam* in Andr. 287 rejected.

But to pass to what we may consider Professor Ashmore's distinctive work, we note at the outset two serious omissions: (1) a summary of Terentian linguistic peculiarities, and (2) a conspectus metrorum. The latter is especially needful in a complete edition of the plays, and is absolutely essential if a student is to undertake any metrical studies. As to the former, the editor says that "space enough for anything resembling an adequate treatment of this topic has been wanting; so far as might be, it has been touched upon in the notes". In lieu of this, he refers students to the "Einleitung" prefixed to the Dziatzko-Haule edition of the *Phormio*. But we may observe first that the useful summary referred to occupies only ten pages, half of which are devoted to foot-notes, and secondly that with such a summary the editor could have dispensed with many notes and unnecessary repetitions.

The Introduction is well written, though exception may be taken to not a few statements. Thus it is said of Menander (p. 6) that "like Terence", he wrote "a goodly number of comedies, no less than one hundred and eight being attributed to him". This is hardly logical, for while Terence may be said to have written a goodly number of plays, yet Menander was wonderfully prolific and produced more than thrice as many as Terence in the same length of time. The editor first (p. 26) rejects the common tradition as to the youthfulness of Ter-

ence at the time of the Andria's composition, and yet, when speaking later of the poet's stylistic qualities, he says that these "appear to be most marvelous in view of his immature years" (p. 29). We are told that "the *iambic octonarius* occurs most frequently in the *cantica*" (p. 51). Does it occur anywhere else? (cf. p. 54). The whole metrical treatment is very slight and there is not a single reference to so important an authority as Klotz (*Grundzüge Altrömischer Metrik*). The editor occasionally shows that he does not appreciate rhythmical difficulties. Thus in Andr. 64, the harshness of rhythm (with the unusual ictus on the final syllable of *studiis* before a diaeresis) led Bentley to delete the second half of the verse with the beginning of the next and to transpose to *eorum studiis obsequi*. Fleckeisen too resorts to transposition. Professor Ashmore's note is: "But if we read *obsequi studiis* the metre will take care of itself, thus: *eorum obsequi studiis, adversus nemini*". In connection with Saturnian verse, the specimen given on p. 12 is not scanned in the same way as the epitaph of Naevius on p. 17, but no explanation is given.

Professor Ashmore accepts *omnia* (Heaut. 575), *Aeschinūs* (Ad. 260), *virginē* (Ad. 346), *accipit* (Eun. 1082), as well as *dicerē* (Andr. 23), *Phaedriā* (Ph. 830), and like scansiones, which are now generally discarded. The statement on p. 58 about a general inclination to slur over or obscure such final consonants as *d*, *l*, *n*, *r* and *t*, involves dangerous doctrine.

In his account of the Terentian codices, our editor professes to be convinced that the  $\gamma$  Mss. are superior to the  $\delta$  group. This, of course, was not the view of Tyrrell when he prepared the text, and though Professor Ashmore does not always approve of Tyrrell's readings, still in most cases he accepts and, in many, even defends Tyrrell's choice, where allegiance to  $\gamma$  would have led him to reject it. Thus, to take a few examples from the Andria, in 103, *igitur*, though not in  $\gamma$ , is retained; in 447, *aliquantum* of  $\gamma$  is given up without comment; in 495, *se ipsus* ought to be *ipsus se*; in 665, *hoc est* should be *est hoc*, with P; in 706; *me nunc* should be *nunc me* (Tyrrell's note is faulty); in 712, *ut* is omitted in  $\gamma$  (the fact is not noticed by Tyrrell); in 717, *putavi*, not *putabam*, is the reading of  $\gamma$ . In 849, Professor Ashmore is ready to reject a good reading, given by all Mss.

The editor and his proof-readers were all nodding, when they gave *Weissner*, instead of *Wessner*, as the editor of Donatus, and when (p. 64) they placed Eugraphius in the fifteenth century, for that learned gentleman was probably a contemporary of Priscian, some nine or ten centuries earlier. We are also assured that Eugraphius "has little value for us", but surely no editor of Terence can afford to disparage him, for his evidence is appealed to not infrequently in determining the text. Examples

may be found in Eun. 248 (where Eugraphius agrees with A in giving the correct reading, though neither Tyrrell nor this editor takes note of it), Andr. 165 (where Eugraphius alone preserves *sin*), 258, 484, 681, 754, etc., etc. But our editor elsewhere shows a failure to appreciate the Roman grammarians. Thus, speaking of the *periochae* of Sulpicius Apollinaris (Notes, p. 3), he says that "their diction is often . . . far removed from any resemblance to classical Latinity"—a statement which, I fear, is far stronger than the facts warrant.

Space will not allow us to examine the Explanatory Notes in detail. Here the editor is at his best and his elucidations are always well put. Many notes, however, could have been omitted if the editor had given in the Introduction a summary of Terentian usages. Even as it is, he sometimes repeats himself. Thus on Andr. 15 he gives the *iambic law* in full, though it already appears on p. 58 of the Introduction. At Andr. 213-214, the notes do not explain the relative in *quo iure quaque iniuria*. We cannot agree with the view that Andr. 225 is interpolated, for it is important that the reader, or rather the spectator, should distinctly realize that Davus disbelieves the story about Glycerium's citizenship. On Andr. 228, the proof-readers have allowed *ἀρκεῖν* to escape them (read *ἀρχειν*). It is rather fanciful to say that there is something "unusually comic" in the use of *cura confectus* in Andr. 304. Ennius writes *senio confectus*; Cicero has *confectus* with *senectute*, *corporis morbo*, *animi dolore*, etc., and Livy shows *lassus* and *confectus* as synonyms. The derivation of *edepol*, given on Andr. 305, as involving a form of *deus*, is very dubious. In Andr. 328, all Mss. give *hae*. Why, then, should the "alternative form" *haec* be read here? Even Cicero sometimes has *haec* for feminine plural, but we do not insist on this form everywhere in his writings. The note on Andr. 338, "*boni, boni*: on 947", leads us nowhere, for *credo credere* is not commented on. That the genitive ending *i* in (e. g.) *ornati* (p. 37) "is a contraction from *ui(s)*", is doubtful doctrine, and if it is "confined to nouns ending in *-tus*", *domi* (which is governed in the same way as *foci* in Eun. 815) is excluded. On Andr. 538, it is said that "the form *Chremes* is recognized by Donatus". It might well be added that in some passages it is the reading of all Mss. This reference should be added in the Index to "declension of *Chremes*".

Inasmuch as an Appendix is provided for the more technical notes on each play, one wonders why many of the annotations found among the ordinary notes were not reserved for this place. Such a note as that on Andr. 248 or that on *aeque*, as contrasted with *nequeo*, in Andr. 434, is more suited to the Appendix. On Andr. 439, Professor Ashmore remarks that "the common text (the conjecture of Erasmus) will do". This can hardly hold, for such a

reading would violate a well-known rule as to the use of *huiusce*. On Andr. 483, nothing is said about the interesting reading *istam*, through Donatus has it and it occurs in the Bembine scholia. In Andr. 702, both Tyrrell and our editor have failed to note that the Mss. give *fortis* to Charinus. In Andr. 787, the question whether *non* or *ne* is to be read must depend on the choice of *credes* or *credas*, which is not discussed. On Andr. 857 Dziatzko should be added to the list of those who accept *veritas*.

To sum up—the work will certainly be found very useful to those who want annotations on all the plays of Terence, but it embraces a faulty text, contains numerous errors in details and must be used with caution.

H. R. FAIRCLOUGH

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, California

### PHI BETA KAPPA

The significance of the three Greek letters which form the title of the Phi Beta Kappa Society has long been a matter of public knowledge. Even the uninitiated may consult the published catalogues of this and that chapter where *Φιλοσοφία Βίου Κυβερνήτης* appears in print. Many things relating to the Society which were not originally included among its secrets are now withdrawn from the knowledge of men simply because no tradition has survived. This is but natural in the case of an organization that has had such a peculiar history as has the parent chapter of the Phi Beta Kappa Society. Founded at William and Mary College in 1776, it early entered upon a period of suspended existence that lasted until 1849. Under the circumstances it is not surprising that the early history of the Society has been of late a subject of learned investigation. In consequence of this investigation much more is now known about the beginnings than was known, for example, thirty years ago.

So far as the present writer has been able to learn no tradition remains as to the man who expressed in Greek the sentiment adopted by the founders as their motto. Much less is there any extant information concerning the mental processes by which this unknown thinker reached his result. This latter subject is a legitimate target for philosophical conjecture. My present purpose is to present such a conjecture.

I advance the thesis that the unknown charter member of the Phi Beta Kappa Society was familiar with Cicero's Tusculan Disputations, and that Cicero's exclamation *O vitae philosophia dux* (5. 2. 5) was in his mind when he framed the motto; and, further, that this unknown student was familiar enough with Plato to be able to think of the *τέχνη κυβερνήτης* as typifying leadership *par excellence*; and, finally, that under Platonic influence this Ciceronian expression was rendered into its present

Greek form, and became the Society's motto.

If the above conjecture is correct, we recover a pleasing picture of this colonial student who was not unfamiliar with his Cicero and his Plato. Not only did he do well to turn back the Latin sentence into Greek: he did better than he knew. It would be too much to attribute to this student, whose mental processes we are seeking to reconstruct, a knowledge of Cicero's indebtedness in this particular passage to his master, the Greek philosopher Posidonius. But the fact that Cicero is here indebted to Posidonius for the sentiment *O vitae philosophia dux* is beyond reasonable doubt. Those who desire to put this statement to the test will find a convenient collection of references in Sussehl's *Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur*, 2. 146, N. 216. A simpler way would be to read attentively the context of the quotation from Cicero and compare it with Seneca's ninetieth Epistle, which is admittedly an important source of our knowledge of Posidonius.

It was well, then, that Cicero's *vitalis philosophia dux* should be turned back into its original tongue. The modern world presumably thinks of the sentiment as an individual's creed about his individual life. Read in its context it yields a meaning slightly different. Cicero and Posidonius were thinking not merely, not even primarily, of the individual, but of man as a social and civilized being. Philosophy is acclaimed as the guide of the race from savagery to civilization. *Bios* is here used as Dicaearchus had used it in his *History of Civilization*, entitled *Bios Ἑλλάδος*. But the modern world will not stop to dispute subtly about quotation and context. A motto is a motto; and this motto has become a winged word that makes its way alone, while the context is quite forgotten.

HAMILTON COLLEGE

EDWARD FITCH

A fine Roman sarcophagus in excellent preservation has been found in the Vicolo Malabarba, outside the Porta S. Lorenzo, at Rome. It is 5 feet 7 inches long by 1 foot 6 inches wide, and the cover measures 5 feet 8 inches by 2 feet 4 inches. The front and one side of the sarcophagus are covered with scenes in relief of a Roman victory over barbarians, probably the Parthians or the Dacians. One of the most spirited incidents is a Roman soldier forcing a captive barbarian to bow down and do obeisance to a youthful figure, representing either a Roman emperor or an imperial general. Other scenes represent a barbarian in chains with his wife and child; a bearded barbarian led by a Roman soldier; and a fine figure of Pegasus, which Prof. Dante Vaglieri believes to have been the standard or ensign of the legion to which the dead man belonged. Inside the sarcophagus were a skeleton, a glass vase, and a silver denarius coined under Titus.